

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Claims 1-6, 8-8-18, 20-30, and 32-36 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected pending claims 1-6, 8-8-18, 20-30, and 32-36 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) as obvious over Graylin (U.S. App. Pub. No. 2003/0033415) and Rajarajan (U.S. App. Pub. No. 2002/00143949). Applicants traverse.

Claims 1, 13, and 25 concern enabling access to workflow resource objects in a workflow engine, and requires: receiving a request, from a calling entity, for workflow resource objects of a specified type in the workflow engine, wherein the specified type of the requested resource objects comprises one of workflow objects, workflow templates and work lists defined in the workflow engine; generating a request to the workflow engine for information on available workflow resource objects of the specified type; in response to receiving the information from the workflow engine, generating a collection object including one metadata element for each workflow resource object of the specified type in the workflow engine; and returning the generated collection object to the calling entity.

In the Response to Arguments, the Examiner found that pg. 8, paras. [0088 and 0091] of Graylin teaches the claim requirement of receiving a request, from a calling entity, for workflow resource objects of a specified type in the workflow engine, wherein the specified type of the requested resource objects comprises one of workflow objects, workflow templates and work lists defined in the workflow engine. (Third Office Action, pg. 7) Applicants traverse.

The cited para. [0088] discusses object oriented programming principles in general, such as object classes that serve as a template which defines a data structure for holding attributes and program instructions. Each class includes a means for instantiating an object from a class template. Nowhere does this cited para. [0088] anywhere teach or mention the claim requirements of receiving a request for workflow resource objects of a specified type in the workflow engine, wherein the specified type of the requested resource objects comprises one of workflow objects, workflow templates and work lists defined in the workflow engine. Instead the cited para. [0088] discusses general object oriented concepts such as classes and instantiating an object form a class template.

During the phone interview, the Examiner mentioned that the “class template” in para. [0088] taught the claim requirement of a workflow template for which information is requested.

Applicants traverse. A workflow template is defined in the Specification as an object including a defined workflow (Specification, pg. 13, para [0033]), where a “workflow defines a series of processes to be performed by users at a client computer.” (Specification, pg. 1, para. [0003]). The cited class template of para. [0088] nowhere teaches or mentions a workflow template including a defined workflow that defines a series of processes performed by users at a computer.

The cited para. [0091] discusses a client object that uses the resources of another server object. User preference elaborating system can be implemented as server objects which can be accessed by client objects seeking user preference information. Objects can communicate using a “publish/subscribe” protocol where an object publishes information received by other objects that subscribe.

Although the cited para. [0091] of Graylin discusses how an object can obtain information from another object, there still is no teaching or mention of the claim requirements of receiving a request for workflow resource objects of a specified type in the workflow engine, wherein the specified type of the requested resource objects comprises one of workflow objects, workflow templates and work lists defined in the workflow engine. Instead, the cited para. [0091] discusses obtaining information from objects in general, not the specific claim requirements.

In the Response to Arguments, the Examiner cited pg. 2, para. [0033] of Graylin as teaching the claim requirement of in response to receiving the information from the workflow engine, generating a collection object including one metadata element for each workflow resource object of the specified type in the workflow engine. (Third Office Action, pg. 7) However, this finding contradicts the Examiner’s finding on pg. 2 of the Third Office Action that Graylin does not disclose this claim requirement.

Notwithstanding, Applicants submit the cited pg. 2, para. [0033] of Graylin does not teach the claim requirement of in response to receiving the information from the workflow engine, generating a collection object including one metadata element for each workflow resource object of the specified type in the workflow engine.

The cited para. [0033] of Graylin discusses a user preference elaborating system including an entitlement processor which receives data from and provides data to an accessor data storage, accessor group data storage and an object registry. The accessors are entities request access to objects or resources. An accessor group refers to a collection of accessors and

an object registry includes individual resources associated with an entitlement expression. An entitlement expression is a specification of access entitlement and has a reference to at least one accessor group and one or more operators.

Although the cited para. [0033] of Graylin discusses requesting access to objects or resources, nowhere does the cited para. [0033] anywhere teach or suggest generating a collection object including one metadata element for each workflow resource object of the specified type in the workflow engine, where the workflow resource object comprises one of workflow objects workflow templates, and worklists defined in a workflow engine.

The Examiner continued to cite pg. 2, para. 11 and pg. 12, para. 101 of Rajarajan as teaching the third and fourth limitations, which recite in response to receiving the information from the workflow engine, generating a collection object including one metadata element for each workflow resource object of the specified type in the workflow engine and returning the generated collection object to the calling entity. (Third Office Action, pg. 3) Applicants traverse.

The cited pg. 2 of Rajarajan mentions maintaining a plurality of resources in a task based manner. A method receives information from resources related to tasks associated with a same type of object and stores the information from the first resource in association with the second resource. The method further receives a request to perform the management task in relation to the first managed object and determines which resource to call in response to the request.

The cited pg. 2 discusses how to store information from resources related to objects and to perform a management task with respect to a managed object. Nowhere does this cited pg. 2 anywhere teach, suggest or mention the claim requirements of in response to receiving the information from a workflow engine, generating a collection object including one metadata element for each workflow resource object of the specified type in the application engine that is returned to a calling entity requesting resource objects of a specified type. There is no teaching of a collection object including metadata on workflow resource objects defined in a workflow engine. Instead the cited pg. 2 generally discusses managing resources in a task based manner.

The cited pg. 12 of Rajarajan mentions that a task handler address is used to generate a request that is sent to the identified resource to collect all dynamic tasks. Task information relates to functions that may be performed on a particular data object, but may not be available for objects of that type. A dynamic task may relate to a particular instance of an object. Para. 102 mentions that the dynamic tasks may be received and merged to form a task list.

Although the cited pg. 12 discusses how to collect information on tasks relating to functions performed on a particular object, nowhere does the cited pg. 12 anywhere teach or suggest the claim requirements of generating a collection object including one metadata element for each workflow resource object of a specified type, such as workflow objects, workflow templates, and workflow lists. Applicants submit collecting information on tasks relating to functions performed on a particular object as mentioned in the cited Rajarajan does not teach or suggest the claim requirement of a collection object including a metadata element for each workflow resource object of a specified type in an workflow engine, including at least one of workflow objects, workflow templates, and workflow lists.

Thus, the cited Rajarajan does not teach or suggest the amended limitations for which it is cited.

Thus, even if one were to combine Graylin and Rajarajan as the Examiner proposes, the cited combination still does not teach or suggest the claim requirements for the reasons discussed above.

Accordingly, claims 1, 13, and 25 are patentable over the cited art because the cited combination does not teach or suggest all the claim requirements.

Claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-18, 20-24, 26-30, and 32-36 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of claims 1, 13, and 25, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, the below discussed dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Amended claims 4, 16, and 28 depend from claims 1, 13, and 25, respectively, and further require that wherein the workflow engine is one of a plurality of workflow engines enabling access to workflow resource objects, wherein the request for the workflow resource objects from the calling entity comprises a method that is a member of a service class implementation of the workflow engine, wherein each workflow engine provides one service class implementation of methods and objects from a same abstract service class implementing the operations of receiving the request, generating the request to the workflow engine, generating the collection object, and returning the generated collection object.

Applicants amended these claims to clarify that the “service engine” is a “workflow engine” and that the “service resources” are “workflow resource objects.” Applicants further added the requirement that the abstract service class implements the operations of receiving the request, generating the request to the workflow engine, generating the collection object, and

returning the generated collection object. This added requirement is disclosed on at least pgs. 31 and 32, paras. [0074] and [0077] of the Specification.

The Examiner cited pg. 7, paras. 72-74 and pg. 3, para. [0038] of Rajarajan as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Third Office Action, pgs. 4, 8) Applicants traverse.

The cited para. 72 of Rajarajan mentions that a configuration manager handles the addition of new resources and communicates with the resources and may configure the resources to allow management of those resources. The configuration manager also provides other managers information on a registered resource. The configuration manager is a web service for which web service methods are provided and other managers may use the methods to get information about the resources.

Nowhere does the above cited pg. 7 anywhere teach or suggest the claim requirement that the cited configuration manager is one of a plurality of workflow engines enabling access to workflow resource objects as claimed. Further, nowhere does the cited pg. 7 anywhere teach or suggest the claim requirement of multiple workflow engines, each providing one service class implementation of methods and objects from a same abstract service class. In fact, the cited pg. 7 teaches away from this requirement because pg. 7 and FIG. 3 shows only one configuration manager 330, not multiple workflow engines each implementing a same abstract service class as claimed.

Yet further, nowhere does the cited pg. 7 anywhere teach or suggest the added claim requirement that the abstract service class implements the operations of receiving the request, generating the request to the workflow engine, generating the collection object, and returning the generated collection object. Instead, the cited Rajarajan discusses generally providing managers information on a registered resource, but nowhere teaches or suggests the specific claim requirements concerning generating a collection object on metadata for workflow resources.

The cited para. 0038 discusses how the client may communicate with a server using different protocols. Nowhere does this cited para. 0038 anywhere teach or suggest a request for workflow resource objects that comprises a method that is a member of a service class implementations of a workflow engine, wherein each service engine provides one service class implementation from a same service object class. Applicants submit that the use of different communication protocols does not teach, suggest or concern the claim requirement of workflow engines providing service class implementations from a same abstract service class.

Accordingly, amended claims 4, 16, and 28 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 5, 17, and 29 depend from claims 1, 13, and 25 and further require that the workflow engine and other service engines comprise workflow products from different vendors. The Examiner cited pg. 20, para. 175 of Rajarajan as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Third Office Action, pg. 4) Applicants traverse.

The cited pg. 20 discusses a search driven model for locating and working with objects without having to navigate through varying applications. The system provides a framework that allows an administrator to work with a specific object or group of objects. Once an object is located, the user may perform tasks associated with that object.

Nowhere does the cited pg. 20 anywhere teach or suggest multiple workflow or service engines comprising workflow products from different vendors. There is no mention of products from different vendors. Instead, the cited pg. 20 discusses a framework to allow an administrator to search and work with objects.

In the Response to Arguments, the Examiner cited pg. 16, para. 131 of Rajarajan as disclosing the claim requirement that multiple workflow engines comprise workflow products from different vendors. (Third Office Action, pg. 9) The cited para. 131 mentions that a client includes a web browser and that applet functions generate a management console in a web browser compatible with the Microsoft .Net framework. Applicants submit that functions generating a management console compatible with a specific framework does not teach, suggest or mention the claim requirement of multiple workflow or service engines comprising workflow products from different vendors. There is no mention in the cited paragraph of workflow products from different vendors as claimed.

Accordingly, claims 5, 17, and 29 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 6, 18, and 30 depend from claims 5, 17, and 29 and further require that the workflow service class implementations from different vendors each include methods and objects from a same abstract workflow service class specifying methods and objects to include in all workflow service class implementations. The Examiner cited pg. 8, para. [0095] of Graylin as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Third Office Action, pgs. 4-5)

The cited pg. 8 of Graylin mentions a distributed software environment based on middleware, which is connectivity software including a set of enabling services that allow multiple processes running on one or machines to interact, such as CORBA and COM/DCOM.

Nowhere does this cited pg. 8 of Graylin teach or suggest workflow service class implementations from different vendors of a same abstract workflow service class. There is no mention of a workflow service class in the cited pg. 8 nor workflow service class implementations from different vendors. Instead, the cited pg. 8 discusses middleware.

Accordingly, claims 6, 18, and 30 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

The additional dependent claims 8-12, 20-24, and 32-36 provide additional requirements that in combination with the base and dependent claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

During the phone interview on March 14th, the Examiner suggested that applicants amend claims 11, 23, and 35 to include the requirements of base claims 1, 13, and 25. Applicants amended claims 11, 23, and 35 as the Examiner suggested to include the requirements of the base claims and to include the requirement of intervening claims 8, 20, and 32 that the collection object is generated using methods from a collection object class. Applicants submit that these claims are patentable over the cited art because they depend from claims 1, 13, and 25, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above, and because the additional requirements of these claims in combination with the base claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

2. Added Claims 37-39 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

Applicants added claims 37-39, which depend from claims 1, 13, and 25. These claims require providing a collection object class implementation of methods from an abstract collection object class used to instantiate and manipulate a collection object including metadata on workflow resource objects available at the workflow engine, wherein the collection object class includes methods used to generate the collection object, wherein the collection object class comprises a workflow engine specific implementation of the abstract collection object class. The additional requirements of these claims are disclosed on at least pgs. 30-34 of the Specification.

Applicants submit that these claims are patentable over the cited art because they depend from claims 1, 13, and 25, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above, and because the additional requirements of these claims in combination with the base claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-6, 9-18, 20-30, and 32-39 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants submit herewith the fee for the claim amendments. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: March 14, 2006

By: _____

David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984